



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/767,191	01/22/2001	Meng-Hsi Chiu	1975-00300	2002

2292 7590 07/16/2004

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

WAHBA, ANDREW W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2661

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/767,191

Applicant(s)

CHIU ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew W Wahba

Art Unit

2661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 January 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 5, line 30, the applicant describes figure 2 as "the circuit", this description is too brief.

Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the m sectional encoding structure of claim 1 (line 3) and two-sectional encoding structure of claim 5 (line 3) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should

include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With regard to claims 1-9, the claimed subject matter is unclear. Claims are written multi-sentence paragraph form. MPEP 608.01(i) requires that any independent claim should contain in the following order, (1) a preamble comprising a general

description, (2) a phrase such as “wherein the improvement comprises” and (3) the elements or steps. The applicant is also advised to ensure that claims are consistent with sections 608.01(i) – 608.01(o) of the MPEP that discuss the format of claims.

With regard to claim 1, the preamble recites a method (line 1) and the applicant proceeds to claim a structure (line 3).

Also with regard to claim 1, the phrase “m sectional encoding structure” (line 3) is not understood. The Office is unsure as to whether the phrase refers to elements 101-104 in FIG 1, or to an element not illustrated.

Also with regard to claim 1, the phrase “operated with (2^n-1) AND bit by bit” is not understood (line 8).

With regard to claim 2, the applicant claims “two methods are presented” (line 2) and “both methods” (line 3), however, the two methods are not stated in claim 2. Also, the term “mingled” (line 3) is not understood as the applicant does not claim the manner in which the “two methods” are “mingled”.

With regard to claim 3, the office is unsure as to the meaning of the phrase “right side” (line 3) or the manner in which the applicant “adjust them” (line 3).

With regard to claim 4, the applicant refers to the “second method” (line 2), however, claim 1 does not refer to a “second method”.

With regard to claim 5, the preamble recites a method (line 1) and the applicant proceeds to claim a structure (line 3).

Also with regard to claim 5, the phrase “two-sectional encoding structure” (line 3) is not understood. The Office is unsure as to whether the phrase refers to any of elements 101-104 in FIG 1, or to an element not illustrated.

Also with regard to claim 5, the phrase “operated with (2^n-1) AND bit by bit” is not understood (line 10).

With regard to claim 6, the applicant claims the “method of implementing the multi-sectional encoding indexing method, according to claim 5” (lines 1 and 2). The applicant, however, does not claim such a method in claim 5. The applicant may have intended to claim the “implementation method of the reverse compensation indexing method” according to claim 5 (claim 5, lines 1 and 2).

With regard to claim 7, the office is unsure as to the meaning of the term “connection amounts” (line 3). The applicant may be referring to the index table that may support a variable number of entries.

Also with regard to claim 7, the applicant claims a receiving unit, the Office is unsure as to whether the receiving unit refers to element 101 in FIG 1 or to an element not illustrated. The applicant also refers to the “input exclusive-OR” (line 5), it is not understood whether the “input” and “receiving unit” refer to the same or different elements. MPEP 608.01(o) does not permit a confusing variety of terms for the same thing.

Also with regard to claim 7, “said unit” (line 4) should read “said receiving unit” as recited by the applicant in line 2.

With regard to claim 8, the applicant refers to "shared memories" (line 2) as well as an "indexing table memory of e entries" (line 2). The Office is unsure whether both terms refer to the same or different elements. MPEP 608.01(o) does not permit a confusing variety of terms for the same thing.

Also with regard to claim 8, the applicant uses the term "TBW", but does not describe it meaning or acronym.

With regard to claim 9, the applicant claims "an applied method of multi-sectional encoding structures whether divided into sets of two sections and every section is regarded ..." (lines 1-2). Use of the word "whether" indicates that there are alternate encoding structures (divided, or ...) , however, no alternative is claimed.

Also in claim 9, the applicant claims "this kind of multi-sectional" (lines 3-4). The phrase "this kind" is not understood and the applicant is advised to employ the phrase "said."

Also in claim 9, the applicant claims a "multi-sectional encoding structures may have the same flexibility necessary for application" (lines 4 and 5). The term flexibility and the manner in which it relates to the reverse compensation method is not understood. Also, the term "may" can be interpreted as "may not". As a result, this portion of the claim does not limit the claim.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew W Wahba whose telephone number is (703) 305-4684. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas W Olms can be reached on (703) 305-4703. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrew Wahba



July 12, 2004



CHAU NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600